

FILE COPY

Supreme Court
FILED

MAY 10 1947

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1947

No. 706

A. N. CONE, PETITIONER,

versus

WEST VIRGINIA PULP AND PAPER COMPANY,
RESPONDENT

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

✓ CHRISTIE BENET,

✓ J. B. S. LYLES,

Columbia, S. C.,

D. A. BROCKINTON,

✓ CHARLES W. WARING,

Charleston, S. C.

Attorneys for Respondent,
West Virginia Pulp and
Paper Company.

INDEX

PAGE

- I. This Court has Already Denied a Motion to Recall
and Amend the Mandate in This Case, 331 U. S.,
794, 91 L. Ed., 1822 1
- II. A Motion for a New Trial is not a Condition Prece-
dent to the Taking of an Appeal Under Federal
Procedure 3
- III. Petitioner has Waived any Right to Complain as to
Offset of Costs 4

INDEX

Page

- I. The first part of the book is devoted to a general survey of the history of the world from the beginning of time to the present day. This part is divided into three sections: (1) The prehistoric period, (2) The ancient period, and (3) The modern period. The first section deals with the period from the beginning of time to the beginning of the recorded history. The second section deals with the period from the beginning of the recorded history to the beginning of the modern period. The third section deals with the period from the beginning of the modern period to the present day.
- II. The second part of the book is devoted to a detailed study of the history of the world from the beginning of the recorded history to the present day. This part is divided into two sections: (1) The history of the world from the beginning of the recorded history to the beginning of the modern period, and (2) The history of the world from the beginning of the modern period to the present day.
- III. The third part of the book is devoted to a detailed study of the history of the world from the beginning of the recorded history to the present day. This part is divided into two sections: (1) The history of the world from the beginning of the recorded history to the beginning of the modern period, and (2) The history of the world from the beginning of the modern period to the present day.

TABLE OF CASES

	PAGE
Aaron v. U. S. (C. C. A.), 155 F. 833, 838	3
American Distilling Co. v. Wisconsin Liquor Co. (C. C. A., 7), 104 F. (2d), 582, 589	4
Boatmen's Bank v. Trower Bros. Co. (C. C. A., 8), 181 F., 804, 806	3
Chicago Life Ins. Co. v. Tiernan (C. C. A., 8), 263 F., 325, 330	3
36 C. J. S., 265	4
Ohio Oil Co. v. Thompson (C. C. A., 8), 120 F. (2d), 831, Cert. den., 314 U. S., 658	3

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT
CHICAGO, ILL.

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the general principles of the theory of the structure of the nucleus. It is shown that the nucleus is a system of protons and neutrons, which are bound together by the strong interaction. The binding energy of the nucleus is calculated, and it is shown that the binding energy per nucleon is a function of the mass number of the nucleus. The binding energy per nucleon is maximum for nuclei with mass number between 10 and 20, and it decreases for larger mass numbers. This is the reason why the most stable nuclei are those with mass number between 10 and 20.

2. In the second part of the paper, the author discusses the properties of the nucleus, such as its size, its charge, and its magnetic moment. It is shown that the size of the nucleus is of the order of 10^{-14} cm, and that the charge of the nucleus is equal to the number of protons in the nucleus. The magnetic moment of the nucleus is also calculated, and it is shown that it is of the order of 10^{-26} J/T.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the properties of the nucleus, such as its stability, its decay, and its reaction. It is shown that the nucleus is stable if the binding energy per nucleon is greater than the binding energy per nucleon of the constituent nucleons. If the binding energy per nucleon is less than the binding energy per nucleon of the constituent nucleons, the nucleus is unstable and it decays. The decay of the nucleus is a process in which the nucleus transforms into a nucleus with a lower mass number and a lower charge number. The reaction of the nucleus is a process in which the nucleus transforms into a nucleus with a different mass number and a different charge number.

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1947

No. 706

A. N. CONE, PETITIONER,

versus

**WEST VIRGINIA PULP AND PAPER COMPANY,
RESPONDENT**

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO CERTIORARI

I. This Court has already denied a motion to recall and amend the mandate in this case, 331 U. S. 794, 91 L. Ed. 1822.

On page 26 of petitioner's brief this statement appears "The scope and effect of the opinion of this Court on certiorari * * * has not heretofore been brought before this Court or before the Court of Appeals." On May 21, 1947, plaintiff-petitioner served notice of his motion whereby this Court was asked to recall and amend its mandate. This motion was made a part of the record on the second appeal to the court below, review of which is hereby petitioned for, by paragraph three of the stipulation of counsel.

This Court was requested by the motion to:

1. Issue a memorandum opinion holding in effect that the Court of Appeals was without jurisdiction on the first appeal because defendant had not made a motion for a new trial following the trial in the District Court, as required by Rule 50(b)—(Grounds 1 and 5 of motion);

2. Require the District Court to issue execution on the original judgment in favor of plaintiff—(Ground 2); and

3. Direct the District Court to levy execution against defendant for plaintiff's costs in the Supreme Court without regard to any offset of costs awarded defendant in the Court of Appeals (Ground 3).

In other words, the motion was based on the theory that this Court had ordered the original judgment of the District Court in favor of plaintiff reinstated. The motion covered both points decided by Judge Waring in the District Court in the order from which the second appeal was taken (R., 18), on the theory advanced by plaintiff, to wit, that the Court of Appeals was without jurisdiction on the original appeal because defendant had not made a motion for a new trial following the verdict in the District Court, when (as plaintiff contended on the motion) this was required by Rule 50(b).

The allegation of the motion that defendant had failed to make a motion for a new trial following the trial in the District Court, was shown by defendant to be *contra* the fact by a certificate of the clerk of the District Court dated May 23, 1947, and by an order of Judge Waring dated December 3, 1945, which were attached to defendant's brief in opposition to the motion as Exhibits "B" and "C" respectively; see R., 24.

The motion to recall and amend was supported by a printed brief of some fourteen pages, whereby this Court

was urged to grant all grounds of the motion. The motion was denied June 16, 1947, in the following words: "The motion to recall and amend the mandate is denied." 331 U. S. 794, 91 L. Ed. 1822. The Court is respectfully referred to respondent's brief in opposition to the motion for pertinent authorities as to the proper construction of the mandate.

The brief for petitioner-appellant on the second appeal, in effect asked the Court of Appeals to make a like ruling as to the construction and effect of the mandate of this Court. But the brief of respondent-appellee pointed out that this was not a new issue arising in the District Court that was outside of the scope of the mandate of this Court, so that the Court of Appeals had no jurisdiction of such a question, citing *Ohio Oil Co. v. Thompson* (C. C. A. 8), 120 F. (2) 831, Cert. Den. 314 U. S. 658.

II. A motion for a new trial is not a condition precedent to the taking of an appeal under federal procedure.

Petitioner now concedes that a motion for a new trial was made by respondent as defendant in the District Court (since we had shown by the record that this was so), but argues that the grounds on which the Court of Appeals reversed the judgment of the District Court on the first appeal were not set forth in that motion for a new trial and that, as a consequence, the Court of Appeals was without jurisdiction to reverse on these grounds.

In our brief in opposition to the motion we cited the following cases in support of the proposition that such a new trial rule does not exist in federal procedure and that the Conformity Act does not apply to such a rule: *Aaron v. U. S.* (C. C. A. 8), 155 F. 833, 838; *Boatmen's Bank v. Trower Bros. Co.* (C. C. A. 8), 181 F. 804, 806; *Chicago Life Ins. Co. v. Tiernan* (C. C. A. 8), 263 F. 325, 330.

We have since found the following additional authorities supporting those citations: In the article on "Federal Courts" in 36 C J. S., 265, it is said: "While a contrary rule prevails in some jurisdictions under state practice, as appears in Appeal and Error, Sections 352-388, a motion for a new trial is not a condition precedent to the taking of an appeal under the federal practice." *Chicago Life Ins. Co. v. Tiernan*, *supra*, is cited in support thereof, and also *American Distilling Co. v. Wisconsin Liquor Co.* (C. C. A. 7), 104 F. (2d), 582, 589, wherein the Court says: "As to defendant's second procedural point it is sufficient to say that a motion for a new trial is not a condition precedent to the taking of an appeal under federal procedure in Federal Courts."

III. Petitioner has waived any right to complain as to offset of costs.

The record of the clerk of the District Court shows that counsel for petitioner accepted and endorsed the clerk's check for \$162.04, representing the balance due plaintiff after the offset of costs, and that the check was cashed prior to September 30, 1947. R., 27-30.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTIE BENET,

J. B. S. LYLES,

Columbia, S. C.,

D. A. BROCKINTON,

CHARLES W. WARING,

Charleston, S. C.,

Attorneys for Respondent,
West Virginia Pulp and
Paper Company.